

be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 26, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 26, 1996, beginning at 9:30 a.m. until business is completed, to hold a hearing on FEC reauthorization, oversight, and campaign finance reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### FEDERAL MINERAL WITHDRAWAL IN THE COOKE CITY, MT AREA

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Senate two thoughts. No. 1, which is the inconsistency with which the present administration deals with land use policy decisions. No. 2, the concept of balance in dealing with land use policy.

Earlier this month the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service announced that they propose to withdraw from mineral entry approximately 19,100 acres in the area surrounding Cooke City, MT. This follows a pledge made by the President to disallow mineral entry into this area for a period of 2 years.

This is an area that is surrounded by lands which already protect the land in question. Congress has previously acted to create a National Park and a Wilderness area to protect the fragile lands in this area. Now the Secretary of the Interior wants to put more land in Montana out of reach for the people of Montana.

In the statement that the Secretary included with the proposal, he has stated in numerous locations that it is the policy of Federal agencies to foster and encourage private enterprise in the development of stable domestic mining. The document also discusses that there will not be any effect on valid existing claims, referring to the New World Mine site presently under study by the Federal land management agencies and the States of Montana and Wyoming.

The purpose of this proposal is exactly the opposite. Before the States can finish their purposed action on mining in this area, the Federal Government steps in to say that they know what is best for everybody. They state that they will consult with local communities on the process. Yet when it comes to the final process they give little or no credit to the words and thoughts of the people that will be most directly impacted by their actions.

All this is stated very clearly in a letter written by Mr. David Rovig of Montana. His letter sets forth a precise

description of the inconsistencies in the proposal put forth by Secretary Babbitt.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter by Mr. Rovig be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

In recent years our Government has fallen prey to the actions of special interest groups that seek to exempt others of the future they are so privileged to have lived. If we are to increase the stability of our country and to develop our future we need to open our minds and eyes to balance, and not close the door on development. We need to be prepared to use our resources to protect the land. These are the aims that the Government needs to seek. It is the goal of the State of Montana to find sound science in the development of the resources my State has been so blessed with.

Work is being done in Montana to protect the future and the land. What Montana seeks is work and jobs to move into the future.

The letter follows:

ROVIG MINERALS, INC.,  
Billings, MT, June 21, 1996.

Senator CONRAD BURNS,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONRAD: I am writing this letter on behalf of the Montana Mining Association in my position as President.

I was recently made aware of a Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service action (see attachments) whereby they propose to withdraw from mineral entry approximately 19,100 acres in the Cooke City area. This administrative action is purportedly being undertaken at the request or direction of Secretary Bruce Babbitt of the Department of the Interior. It follows on the heels of President Clinton's promise, catering to the environmental community, that this area would be suspended from mineral entry for a period of two years. I think you know the history of this hoax—the President flew over the area at 10,000 feet and then determined in a secret meeting with multiple environmental groups that he would save the area from the nasty miners.

The continued effort now being foisted on us by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service is a very expensive attempt to appease environmental groups with taxpayer money while in reality accomplishing nothing. Cooke City sits in the middle of a multi-million acre area of previously withdrawn wilderness and national parks. The 19,000 or 20,000 acres represented is one of the very few areas in this gigantic enclave where any degree of free enterprise can be pursued. The Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Secretary and the environmental community keep trying to portray the Cooke City area as a forgotten or overlooked part of their personal preserve. The reality is that the New World Mining district was specifically excluded when Yellowstone Park was formed by virtue of the fact that it was an active mining district. Furthermore, in the 1970's when the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness Area was formed, it was again specifically excluded by virtue of its intense mineral potential. That mineral potential still exists today as demonstrated by the reserves recently drilled out by Crown Butte Mines, Inc.

In the government support information, the following statement was made, "The withdrawal has been proposed by the Secretary of the Interior to maintain, to the ex-

tent practical, resource values in the area and on adjacent lands in Yellowstone National Park and the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness Area." It is obvious from this statement that the Secretary has redefined resource values to exclude mineral resources. Yet in the accompanying information sheet dated June 1996, we see the following paragraph: "Under the Mining and Mineral Policy Act, it is the policy of all Federal agencies to foster and encourage private enterprise in the development of economically sound and stable domestic mining, minerals, metal and mineral reclamation industries; and the orderly and economic development of domestic mineral resources, reserves, and reclamation of metals and minerals to help assure satisfaction of industrial, security and environmental needs."

There are many other inconsistencies in the government's position such as the statement: "The withdrawal would not affect those lands in the area for which there are valid existing rights of mineral entry or any other associated rights, such as access to private land or existing mineral claims."

This is inconsistent since the very concept of mineral entry allows for the staking of mill site claims to help develop a mining claim. Under Babbitt's proposal new mill site claims would not be allowed thus denying owners of valid existing mineral rights, their other associated rights. The information sheet makes the absurd statement that: "The New World Mine proposal, being analyzed by the Gallatin National Forest, is not considered as a 'connected action' to the withdrawal proposal and will not be considered in the analysis. The New World Mine proposal applies to an area for which there were valid rights established prior to the proposed withdrawal."

Anyone who has followed the proposed development of the New World Mine knows very well that the withdrawal issue would never have arisen were it not for Clinton's secret meeting with the environmentalists. Of course, the New World Mine proposal should be considered a connected action, and the very fact that its multi-volume Environmental Impact Statement has been written to cover the very heart of the proposed withdrawal demands that it be considered as a connected action, thus proving the district's mineral viability.

Even if you accept the position that this proposed activity will not affect existing mining activities and claims, then you must seriously question why the government wants to take this very expensive multi-year action to withdraw the surrounding ground. Another major consideration is the concept of administrative withdrawals on our ever dwindling mineral resource locales. The prospector and the wildcatter cannot find their minerals where no minerals exist. We must be allowed to look in those places where geologic conditions allow for the presence of commercial minerals. Already thousands of acres of highly prospective mineral locations have been lost to the bureaucratic procedures that simply do not recognize the incredible importance of minerals to this country's past, present and future. There are no great nations that do not have near self-sufficiency for their mineral needs.

I hope that through the budget process, or some of the other magic that goes on in Washington, you can stop this wasteful and unnecessary proposal but, if not, I plead for you to work with us to ensure that a degree of logic and common sense is incorporated in the procedure. This would include review of the studies by the United States Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey and various states agencies. It must also consider how small this area is when compared to the vast wilderness and park system

that surrounds it. It is clear to me that if Babbitt's mineral withdrawal succeeds there will be subsequent steps to pick away at the area until it ultimately would be consumed by the wilderness system.

As a matter of standing policy, the Montana Mining Association is opposed to administrative withdrawals of any lands from mineral entry. In this instance, the egregious violation of the intent of the withdrawal procedure for the sole purpose of mollifying preservationist interests solidifies our resolve. We firmly believe that the continual hijacking of established procedures to achieve political ends must stop. Please help us help ourselves and the country to thwart this effort.

Very truly yours,

DAVID B. ROVIG.●

#### GLEN GENSEAL AND SPRINGFIELD'S NEW KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the community of Springfield, IL, recently dedicated a new Korean War Memorial which features, inscribed in stone, this poem, written by Glen Genseal in tribute to our fallen soldiers in Korea:

MY BRAVE YOUNG MEN

(by Glen Genseal)

I took a walk in the park of my old home town

Hardly noticing anything that was around.

Just this day, I don't know why,

I looked at the cannon and stone war plaque when passing by.

There were name upon names written on the plaque

Of brave young men who never came back.

A certain guilty feeling came over me,

I didn't know why, but I was soon to see.

Off in the distance, I thought I heard

Soldiers marching to cadence and time.

I blinked my eyes, shook my head,

Looked at the plaque,

And here's what it said:

Take a good look at my brave young men as they go marching by,

I want you to hear all their widows and mothers cry.

I want you to touch each salty tear,

And feel each heartache, that will never disappear.

Look into the lost eyes of every wife, mother, and dad,

Then gently squeeze the small hand of each fatherless child

That war has left so sad.

Oh my friend, never forget as you walk by,

The sacrifice of my brave young men who had to die.

Let it be known and always ever so plain,

That my brave young men did not die in vain.

America will always be the home of the brave,

America will always be the land of the free.

Because of the life of each young man

Whose name, written in blood, is upon me.

God bless America and my brave young men.

Mr. President, Tracy Johnson, who has done a superb job for the people of Illinois and for me in my office in Springfield, is the daughter of Glen Genseal. She is proud of her father and of his contribution to this lasting and fitting memorial to those who served

and died in Korea, and I am proud of them both.

#### SURGING TAX BURDEN UNDER PRESIDENT CLINTON

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, under President Bill Clinton, the Federal tax burden as a percentage of national income has risen to the second highest level in American history. As reported by economist Bruce Bartlett, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, in the first quarter of 1996 Federal taxes consumed 20.5 percent of gross domestic product. Only during periods of war and other unique economic circumstances has the tax burden risen to such levels. For instance, at the height of World War II in 1945, and of the Vietnam war in 1969, Federal taxes took only 20.1 percent and 20.3 percent of GDP, respectively. During the late 1970's and early 1980's, double-digit inflation and a Tax Code that was not indexed for inflation pushed the tax burden to an all-time high of 20.8 percent of GDP. President Clinton's 1993 tax increase—the biggest tax increase in the history of the world—is largely responsible for raising the tax burden from 19.2 percent of GDP in President Bush's last year to today's 20.5 percent of GDP. In my view, there is absolutely no justification for imposing such a heavy tax burden on the American people. We ought to let American people keep more of what they earn so that they can do more for their families and communities. And the best way to accomplish this is to reduce income tax rates for everyone by at least 15 percent.

I ask that Mr. Bartlett's Detroit News editorial be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The editorial follows:

[From the Detroit News, June 24, 1996]

A SURGING RECORD OF CLINTON TAX LOAD

(By Bruce Bartlett)

Recently released data show federal taxes continuing their relentless upward trend. As I have previously reported, federal taxes consumed 20.4 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) last year—the second highest level in American history.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, however, in the first quarter of 1996 federal revenues have risen by another 0.1 percent to 20.5 percent of GDP. As the figure indicates, federal revenues have now risen by 1.5 percentage points of GDP during the Clinton administration.

This works out to an increase of just over 0.1 percent of GDP every quarter Bill Clinton has been in office. On this basis, we can anticipate that by the fourth quarter of 1996 federal revenues will equal their all-time high of 20.8 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office now estimates that gross domestic product will amount to \$7,584 billion in 1996. Thus if revenues were simply to return to the level they were at when Bill Clinton took office, we would have to cut taxes by \$114 billion this year. And every quarter that tax revenues as a share of GDP rise another 0.1 percent, we must increase the size of the tax cut by an additional \$7.6 billion.

Predictably, the Clinton administration is hostile to the idea of a tax cut. With the sole exception of John F. Kennedy, no Democratic president in history has ever proposed a major tax cut. Democrats always want to hold on to every last dollar of the taxpayers' money—no tax cut is ever as valuable to them as the equivalent amount of government spending.

Even if they were convinced that a tax cut was justified, it is always "unfair" to cut tax rates because that means that those who pay the most taxes get a bigger tax cut. That is why Democrats like tax credits, because they are tax equivalent of government spending. Republicans, by contrast, have historically supported tax rate reductions and increases in tax exemptions, which allow people to keep more of their own money.

Republicans in Congress, therefore, committed a fatal error when they made the \$500 child credit the centerpiece of their tax plan. It essentially is Democratic tax policy. As a result, the differences between the two parties on the central issue of taxation have become blurred.

Moreover, the Republicans' obsession with balancing the budget at all costs has blinded them to the need for a tax cut vastly larger than the minuscule \$122 billion over six years that they have proposed in their latest budget. They should be talking about a tax rate reduction of at least 15 percent across the board.●

#### LT. COL. BRYAN T. LAWLER

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a gentleman of outstanding character and dedication to his country. Lieutenant Colonel Bryan T. Lawler of Eldora, IA has served in the U.S. Air Force for 22 years and will retire from active duty on August 1, 1996.

Colonel Lawler's military education in 1974, when he attended and graduated from the Minuteman Missile Launch Officer training course. Subsequently, after graduating in the top third of the class from Squadron Officer's school, Bryan Lawler's education culminated with a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Iowa's College of Law. He had been competitively selected for the Funded Legal Education Program and graduated with high distinction. Colonel Lawler also attended the Air Command and Staff College.

During his 22 years of service, Colonel Lawler put his Iowa Hawkeye law degree to exemplary use. He served in the base legal office at Seymour-Johnson AFB, defense counsel at RAF Upper Heyford in the United Kingdom, and Utility Legislation Counsel at Tyndall AFB in Florida. He also served as the Staff Judge Advocate at Moody AFB. He continued his service overseas, being stationed, again, in the United Kingdom and in Saudi Arabia. While in Saudi Arabia Colonel Lawler was selected to serve as one of the legal advisors who investigated the shootdown of two U.S. Army helicopters in Northern Iraq. The Colonel finishes his distinguished career as Deputy Staff Judge Advocate for the Headquarter Fifteenth Air Force at Travis AFB.

Because of his outstanding achievements during his services with the U.S.